

energy needs. There are a variety of sources for energy production. We need to move ahead on each of them. That is my view.

Mr. REID. There is no magic bullet, not one thing that is going to solve all the problems of energy relating to our country's needs; is that true?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, again, that is certainly my view. There is no single solution to the problem. We need to make progress on increased energy supplies from a great many sources. We need to make progress on more efficiency in various ways. Clearly, we need to do a better job of conserving the energy we do produce.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired. Morning business is closed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the matter now before the Senate?

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the consideration of (S. 1246) a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agriculture producers.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to one of the managers of the bill, Senator LUGAR, for a few minutes. He has now left the Chamber. Senator HARKIN will be here probably around 2:30. Senator LUGAR and I thought it would be appropriate, until the two managers arrive, if anyone wants to speak on this bill or agricultural matters in general, they should feel free to do so.

If not, I respectfully suggest that we should move to morning business until the two managers are ready to move forward on this most important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, unfortunately, the Senator from New

Mexico, chairman of the Energy Committee, is not in the Chamber now. I had hoped to be able to pose a question to him.

That question would have been regarding his comment indicating he was opposed to opening ANWR. He did not give a reason why, nor did he have to. I hope we will have an opportunity on this particular issue to have a good debate, a debate that evaluates the issue in its entirety.

One of the things I keep referring to, with which the occupant of the Chair has some familiarity, is the unique circumstances surrounding a very small number of aboriginal residents of the north slope, the residents of Kaktovik. Their particular plight lends itself to some consideration by this body.

I don't think I will have the opportunity of using the charts, but I can probably show this better if one of the gentlemen will go back and I can get them to show the actual ownership in the 1002 area of the 92,000 acres of land that is owned by these aboriginal people.

This is the historical land of their birthright. It is their village land. As a consequence of the manner in which the Federal Government chose the structure of management of the 1002 area and the surrounding area associated within ANWR, we found an enclave of 92,000 acres of private land that could not be utilized by the villagers who own the land.

One has to address the propriety of what private land is all about, if indeed you can't use it. This particular area is in such a specific directive from Congress that the residents, the owners can't even drill for natural gas to heat their homes, let alone develop any of the subsurface rights for their where-withal, simply because there is no way to access the area without trespassing on Federal land. This doesn't seem reasonable or fair.

I am sorry to say the charts have gone back to my office. I will have to address this matter again with a visual presentation.

These are the kinds of considerations that aren't addressed and would be addressed in the proposed legislation to authorize the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Why should this group of Alaska Eskimos be denied the birthright to resource their land as any other American citizen would?

This is just one inconsistency associated with this issue. It is a type of issue that would fall on the ears of many in this body who believe in fairness and equity. That is a factor in the consideration of the merits.

I am continually confronted with Members who say: I am opposed to it. They are very reluctant to get into a debate as to why. The rationale is pretty obvious. There is a lot of pressure from America's environmental community. America's environmental community has generated an awful lot of membership and dollars by taking a stand on this issue and laying down a

fear that somehow we cannot open this area safely or that somehow it is contrary to traditional use to drill in a refuge.

As I have indicated earlier in my presentation today, we have oil and gas drilling in 30 refuges in this country. We have 118 refuges where there is actual oil, gas, and minerals. There are over 400 wells in the refuges in Louisiana. We have them in New Mexico. Why is it inappropriate to suddenly say we cannot allow drilling in the 1002 refuge area when we have advanced technology? There is no justifiable reason other than the pressure that is brought on Members by the environmental community. That is the kind of debate I hope we can get into.

I would like to see scientific evidence that suggests, if indeed there is a rationale to support it, that we can't do it correctly; scientific evidence to suggest that Prudhoe Bay is not the best oil field in the world in its 30-year old technology; scientific evidence to suggest that this won't create literally thousands of new jobs, such as 700,000, in the United States. Almost every State in the Union would benefit from this.

I would like to hear a debate as to why it is in the interest this country to become more dependent on the Saddam Husseins of this world. That is what has happened. As we know, 6 weeks ago, we were at 750,000 barrels a day. Today we are a million barrels a day. Are we here to do what is right for America or are we here to simply respond to the pressures of America's environmental community as it laments on fear tactics that are not based on any scientifically sound research?

That is the reality with which we are faced. As we look at what is happening in the House of Representatives this week, they are going to take up the issue.

There is going to be a motion to strike ANWR from the energy bill. It is kind of amazing to me to see what is happening over there because organized labor suddenly has said this is a jobs issue; that we are losing jobs all over the United States. But right now the one item that we can identify that would allow for the creation of thousands of new jobs is opening this area. So it is an argument as to whether you can do it safely; whether we can protect the Porcupine caribou herd; whether we can get the oil on line soon enough—in 3½ years—or whether it is a substantial supply.

As I have indicated, if it is there in the abundance it would have to be to replace what we import from Saudi Arabia in a 3-year period of time, can we do it safely? There is no evidence to suggest that we can't. These are the discussions that we will have. I hope every Member will encourage open debate on this floor on the merits of opening ANWR. I have heard people say, "I would rather this didn't come up" and "I would rather we didn't have to vote on this" and "it makes me feel uncomfortable."